

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
HAMMOND DIVISION AT LAFAYETTE**

ROSEMARY GUERRA,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CAUSE NO.: 4:19-CV-75-TLS-JPK
)	
LOWE'S HOME CENTERS LLC,)	
Defendant.)	

OPINION AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court *sua sponte*. The Court must continuously police its subject matter jurisdiction. *Hay v. Ind. State Bd. of Tax Comm'rs*, 312 F.3d 876, 879 (7th Cir. 2002). The Court must dismiss this action if the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). Currently, the Court is unable to determine if it has subject matter jurisdiction over this litigation.

Defendant Lowe's Home Centers, LLC invoked this Court's subject matter jurisdiction via diversity jurisdiction by filing a Notice of Removal to federal court. As the party seeking federal jurisdiction, Defendant has the burden of establishing that subject matter jurisdiction exists. *Smart v. Local 702 Int'l Bhd. of Elec. Workers*, 562 F.3d 798, 802-03 (7th Cir. 2009).

For the Court to have diversity jurisdiction, Plaintiff Rosemary Guerra and Defendant must be citizens of different states, and the amount in controversy must be more than \$75,000. Defendant has alleged a sufficient amount in controversy. Defendant has also sufficiently alleged the citizenship of Plaintiff. However, the allegations are insufficient as to the citizenship of Defendant.

The Notice of Removal alleges that Defendant is "a corporation incorporated in North Carolina with a main administrative office and principal place of business at 1605 Curtis Bridge

Road, Wilkesboro, NC 28697.” (Notice of Removal ¶ 6, ECF No. 1). It further alleges that “[a]ll members of Lowe’s Home Centers, LLC are domiciled in and/or citizens of North Carolina.” *Id.* These allegations are insufficient for the purpose of determining citizenship.

The allegations regarding the citizenship of Defendant are unclear as to whether it is “incorporated,” and thus, a corporation, or whether it is “organized” as a limited liability company. This distinction is important because for purposes of establishing diversity jurisdiction, a limited liability company’s citizenship is different than that of a corporation. Corporations “are deemed to be citizens of the state in which they are incorporated and the state in which they have their principal place of business.” *N. Trust Co. v. Bunge Corp.*, 899 F.2d 591, 594 (7th Cir. 1990) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1)). The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals has further “held that ‘when one corporation sues another and the only basis of federal jurisdiction is diversity, the [party asserting federal jurisdiction] must allege both the state of incorporation *and* the state of principal place of business for each corporation.’” *Wojan v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 851 F.2d 969, 974-75 (7th Cir. 1988) (citing *Casio, Inc. v. S.M. & R. Co., Inc.*, 755 F.2d 528, 529-30 (7th Cir. 1985)); *see also Karazanov v. Madison Two Assocs.*, 147 F.3d 624, 628 (7th Cir. 1998) (“in cases with corporate parties, it is necessary to allege both the state of incorporation and the state of the principal place of business, even if they are one and the same.” (internal citation omitted)).

Conversely, a limited liability company’s citizenship “for purposes of . . . diversity jurisdiction is the citizenship of its members.” *Cosgrove v. Bartolotta*, 150 F.3d 729, 731 (7th Cir. 1998). Therefore, if Defendant is actually a limited liability company, the Court must be advised of the identity of each of its members and advised of each member’s citizenship. *Thomas v. Guardsmark, LLC*, 487 F.3d 531, 534 (7th Cir. 2007) (“an LLC’s jurisdictional statement must identify the citizenship of each of its members as of the date the complaint or notice of removal

was filed, and, if those members have members, the citizenship of those members as well.”). It is not sufficient to broadly allege that all members of a limited liability company are citizens of a particular state. *See Guar. Nat’l Title Co. v. J.E.G. Assocs.*, 101 F.3d 57, 59 (7th Cir. 1996) (explaining that the court would “need to know the name and citizenship(s)” of each partner for diversity jurisdiction purposes). Moreover, citizenship must be “traced through multiple levels” for those members who are a partnership or a limited liability company, as anything less can result in a remand for want of jurisdiction. *Mut. Assignment & Indem. Co. v. Lind-Waldock & Co., LLC*, 364 F.3d 858, 861 (7th Cir. 2004).

Given the importance of determining the Court’s jurisdiction to hear this case, Defendant must first allege whether it is “incorporated,” and thus, a corporation, or whether it is “organized” as a limited liability company or another form of business entity. Defendant must then sufficiently allege its citizenship as outlined above. Therefore, the Court **ORDERS** Defendant to **FILE**, on or before **August 29, 2019**, a supplemental jurisdictional statement that properly alleges Defendant Lowe’s Home Centers, LLC’s citizenship as stated above.

So ORDERED this 15th day of August, 2019.

s/ Joshua P. Kolar
MAGISTRATE JUDGE JOSHUA P. KOLAR
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT